

# American Opinion Summary

Permanent file copy  
Do not remove.

## Department of State

No. 83

September 5, 1962

## CUBA

Commentators divide sharply over the course the U. S. should take regarding Cuba, where virtually all agree "a buildup of Russian influence" has served to "breach" the Monroe Doctrine.

Many applaud the President's resistance to calls for an immediate U. S. invasion of Cuba (e.g., N. Y. Times and Post, C. S. Monitor, Wash. Star). "By moving in the direction he is now traveling, Mr. Khrushchev may soon be putting both the doctrine and Mr. Kennedy to a severe test," the New York Herald Tribune declares; nevertheless, "it should be the President of the U. S.—not the dictator of the Soviet Union—who should decide when to invoke the Monroe Doctrine and how to uphold it most effectively."

The Baltimore Sun welcomes the President's Tuesday statement on Cuba as both "a warning to Castro and his Soviet masters" and "notice to hotheads in this country that their demands for another romantic adventure into Cuba will continue to go unheeded," unless such action becomes an urgent necessity. "Khrushchev should know that the presidential patience over Cuba is not inexhaustible," suggests Chalmers Roberts (in Wash. Post).

As Sen. Sparkman (D-Ala.) lauds the Administration's "watch and be careful" course on Cuba as "the right approach," Rep. Petty (R-Wash.) urges fellow Republicans to "bend over backward to be bipartisan" and support the President's prerogative concerning Cuban policy.

Granted that developments in Cuba today are those the Monroe Doctrine "was intended to prevent," declares the Washington Post, "what ought to be done about the Cuban crisis is not as plain." Arthur Krock holds that President Kennedy cannot invoke the Doctrine "with the diplomatic consistency and immunity from disaster" previous Executives enjoyed; "his one and only test for compulsive action toward Cuba is whether the U. S. will be endangered otherwise" (in N. Y. Times).

But a number voice great impatience with U. S. "complacency" regarding Cuba (e.g., U. S. News & World Report, N. Y. News and Mirror, Henry J. Taylor, Republican Reps. Bell and Rousselot (Calif.), Cramer (Fla.)). The U. S. has now

- 2 -

"strongly implied" that it will stand by the Monroe Doctrine, the Wall Street Journal states; but it now must "convince the world that it means exactly what it says." To Scripps-Howard's Washington News, the President's attitude merely "temporizes with a situation which soon must require firm action."

Some call for armed U. S. intervention [e.g., John S. Knight, Dem. Sens. Smathers (Fla.) and Thurmond (S. C.)]. Others would prefer "that not just the U. S. unilaterally, but OAS investigate and take any necessary action" [e.g., Republican Sens. Wiley (Wis.) and Keating (N. Y.)]. But, "failing this, the U. S. should act alone to clear the Soviet military apparatus from Castro Cuba, come what might," William S. White maintains.

Several take strong exception to the use of our NATO allies' ships for the shipments of goods to Cuba [e.g., Wash. News, Rep. Marsha (R-O.)]. If we are unable to "call our allies to account," we could "easily blacklist the shipowners," the New York Herald Tribune proposes.